

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMISSIONERS
OF THE
CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY

The Commissioners of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority met for a regular session on Monday, April 23, 2012, in the offices of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority, 2624 Salem Turnpike, NW, in the City of Roanoke, Virginia.

I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Chairperson Garner called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. and declared that a quorum was present.

PRESENT: Commissioners Boitnott, Burruss, Garner, Karnes, Smith, Witten

Commissioner Butler arrived at 3:02 p.m.

OFFICER PRESENT: Glenda Edwards, Secretary-Treasurer

ALSO PRESENT: Cathy Wells, VP of Resident Services and Administration; Jackie Austin, VP of Finance/CFO; Joel Shank, VP of Operations; Helen Shampine, HCV Director; Desi Wynter, Director of Redevelopment and Modernization; David Bustamante, Director of Housing; Gloria Charlton, FSS Coordinator; Lydia Fuller, Resident Relations Coordinator; Katie Meyer, Executive Assistant; Nick Conte, Legal Counsel; Donald Jump, Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP

Chairperson Garner welcomed everyone to today's meeting.

II. REPORTS

1. Financial Report

Chairperson Garner asked for the Financial Report.

Ms. Austin, RRHA VP of Finance/CFO, referred to page 23 of the Monthly Operations Report Finance Section and stated that all Public Housing sites are utilizing reserves to fund a portion of operations expenses. The total amount of reserve used through the first six months of the fiscal year ending March 2012 is approximately \$326,000. Dwelling rental is under budget approximately \$31,000, mostly attributable to several of the sites being under 95% occupancy for a portion of the year. Total expenses are showing a favorable variance of approximately \$71,000 and administrative expenses are approximately \$82,000 under budget due to costs that were budgeted but have not been incurred as of March 31, 2012. Utility expenses are under budget approximately \$71,000 due to anticipated rate increases that have not been enacted and the record-breaking mild winter. Ordinary maintenance is over budget approximately \$55,000 due to unit turnaround and Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) inspections. General expenses are under budget approximately \$90,000 due to reduced insurance costs and debt setoff collections from the Virginia Department of Taxation. Extraordinary maintenance is over budget approximately \$51,000 due to unanticipated siding replacement at Indian Rock Village, bathtub refinishing that needed to be completed in order to prepare for REAC inspections, and playground equipment that was purchased for Lansdowne Park. Replacement of equipment is over budget approximately \$83,000 due to the purchase of trucks at several sites in order to have dependable vehicles for the winter season and the purchase of lawn mowers for Melrose Towers and Hunt Manor. During the month of October one lease-purchase house was sold, resulting in the transfer of approximately

\$85,000 in assets to the Public Housing Program. The assets are being held in the HOPE VI Grant which has not been closed out.

The Central Office Cost Center (COCC) is reporting a net loss of approximately \$28,000 as shown on page 32. Total expenses are showing an unfavorable variance of approximately \$41,000, and administrative expenses are showing a negative variance of almost \$53,000 primarily due to salary expense for a position that was not budgeted for the year, but employment continued through the first quarter of the fiscal year. Also, remaining Paid Time Off (PTO) balances from 2011 were paid out to staff. Legal expenses are showing an unfavorable variance of approximately \$10,000.

The Section 8 program is reporting a difference in revenues over expenses of approximately \$62,000 as shown on page 33. Total expenses are showing a favorable variance of approximately \$56,000. Administrative expenses are under budget approximately \$41,000 due to vacant positions and expenses that have not been incurred to date. A Housing Choice Voucher Specialist was hired January 2012.

Ms. Austin asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Chairperson Garner thanked Ms. Austin for her report.

2. Executive Director's Report

Chairperson Garner asked for the Executive Director's report.

Ms. Glenda Edwards, RRHA Executive Director, introduced Mr. David Bustamante, RRHA's new Director of Housing. Mr. Bustamante began employment with RRHA on April 2 and brings relevant management background in public housing and Section 8. He was most recently employed with the Palm Beach County Housing Authority and, prior to that, worked for the Hialeah Housing Authority. The Board of

Commissioners welcomed Mr. Bustamante.

Ms. Edwards referred to her written report in the Monthly Operations Report and stated that RRHA has launched a new website that includes a language translator on the home page that will translate the entire website to a language the user selects for better accessibility to information in a language each website visitor can understand. The previous website required RRHA to rely on the web page designer to make most content changes at a cost to RRHA. With the new website RRHA can make most necessary changes to layout, content and design. The goal is to add additional policies and forms to make it easier for applicants, contractors, vendors, and others to learn about and interact with RRHA. Ms. Edwards stated that the new website is not lavish but is visually appealing.

Ms. Edwards stated that HUD released the latest Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) scores and, as a result of the significant changes to the PHAS scoring system implemented mid-year in 2011, RRHA is now designated Standard Performer. This means RRHA is no longer eligible to submit a Moving to Work Demonstration Program application. Ms. Edwards stated that she is disappointed that RRHA will not be able to submit the application for the Moving to Work Demonstration Program; however, she does not believe RRHA will remain in Standard Performer designation for long and a future application to the Moving to Work program should be possible.

Ms. Edwards stated that Mr. Desi Wynter, RRHA Director of Redevelopment and Modernization, is diligently working on a grant application for a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant, and the application is due May 1, 2012. Ms. Edwards stated that community meetings have been held, Mr. Wynter has met with the Neighborhood

Associations, and input has been gathered from the City of Roanoke. Mr. Wynter has received letters of in-kind support from several organizations and, although the application process is extremely competitive, Ms. Edwards is optimistic and believes RRHA's application is strong. Ms. Edwards stated that a Resolution will be presented to the Board today to authorize the Board Chair to sign required certifications and agreements on behalf of the Board of Commissioners and to authorize the Executive Director to execute documents required for the application.

Ms. Edwards stated that there will be additional updates to the Annual Plan due to RRHA's Standard Performer designation. There are sections of the Annual Plan that are not required when a housing authority is designated High Performer. Those sections will need to be completed since the designation has changed; therefore, those sections of the Plan will be updated and distributed to Commissioners as well as posted on the website.

Chair Garner asked if there was any input gathered from housing authorities about the way the PHAS scoring system was implemented mid-year and the impact it had on many housing authorities.

Ms. Edwards stated that during the conversion to Asset Management there was a proposed rule that included a plan for PHAS scoring to result from onsite management reviews by HUD every year which proceeded as far as the final comment period. However, the federal administration changed in January 2009, before the regulations were final for the new scoring system. At that time, all new regulations were put on hold pending review by the new administration, and HUD reinstated the previous system of self-certification in 2010.

Ms. Edwards stated that the new scoring system implemented in March 2011 is quite different from the regulations that were previously proposed and put on hold. The new PHAS scoring system applied to housing authorities with fiscal years ending March 31, 2011 and beyond. Therefore, some housing authorities, particularly those with fiscal years ending March 31 and June 30, 2011, had even less ability than RRHA to prepare for the new scoring. Ms. Edwards stated that the primary factor that impacted negatively on RRHA was the occupancy standards, which changed from 95% to 98%. RRHA was meeting the 95% measure but was not able to achieve a 98% measure for the year within the remaining 6 months of RRHA's fiscal year after the new scoring system was implemented. The PHAS scoring difference between 98% and 95% occupancy is more than 16 points.

Chairperson Garner stated that Mr. Bustamante has quite a large task to tackle. Mr. Bustamante stated that Chairperson Garner is correct, and he is already working to improve the occupancy rate for public housing.

Chairperson Garner thanked Ms. Edwards for her report and asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

3. Staff Reports

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any staff reports. There were none.

4. Committee Reports

Chairperson Garner asked for committee reports.

Commissioner Karnes stated that the Personnel Committee had met and discussed several policies that will be brought before the Board today and began reviewing the Workplace Violence policy.

Chairperson Garner stated that the Audit Committee had met, and he will defer to Mr. Donald Jump, with Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP, and the forthcoming presentation.

5. Commissioner Comments

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any Commissioner comments. There were none.

6. Residents or other community members to address the Board

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any residents or other community members who would like to address the Board. There were none.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

C-1 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Commissioners held Monday, March 26, 2012.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Dispense with the reading thereof and approve as recorded.

C-2 Monthly Operations Report for the month of March 2012.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: File as submitted

Commissioner Smith introduced a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Butler and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner thereupon declared said motion carried as introduced.

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

1. Presentation of Audit Draft – Donald Jump, Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP

Chairperson Garner introduced Mr. Don Jump with Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP, to present the results of the fiscal year end September 30, 2011 audit and stated that this was the third year Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP performed the audit for RRHA.

Mr. Jump thanked Ms. Austin and Chairperson Garner and stated that a conference call had taken place with Ms. Edwards, Ms. Austin, Chairperson Garner and Commissioner Witten, and Mr. Jump also met with Chairperson Garner today. Mr. Jump stated that the audit process is complete, and there were no audit findings. The auditors found no deficiencies in internal controls or financial reporting for major programs. Mr. Jump stated that there were no disagreements between management and the auditors. Any adjustments that were made were relatively minor and worked through together by management and the auditors.

Mr. Jump stated that the audit process actually consists of two types of audit, the compliance audit and the financial statement audit.

Mr. Jump stated that the financial audit includes information relative to discretely presented component units, which are the Low Income Tax Credit partnerships. Mr. Jump stated that another auditing firm conducted the audits for the component units, and the financial information from those audits is presented in a separate column in the RRHA financial statements.

Mr. Jump stated that the opinion is an unqualified, clean opinion. Mr. Jump stated that there were no deficiencies in financial reporting and that the results of the

auditors' testing showed no instances of non-compliance with governmental laws and regulations.

Mr. Jump stated that net assets are broken up into those that are invested into the infrastructure, restricted assets which are Housing Choice Vouchers, loan loss reserves and a few other items, and unrestricted. Unrestricted net assets for RRHA equal just under \$14,896,000. Mr. Jump stated that the only unusual change in net assets is an impairment loss of approximately \$1,800,000 that had to be taken on the sale of a condemned property in the South Jefferson Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Jump stated that, because RRHA receives federal funds, the compliance audit, conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards, consists of evaluating whether RRHA has established and is maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to the federal and state programs. Mr. Jump stated that HUD requires auditors to select major programs for audit each year. The programs chosen this year were Low Income Public Housing, Public Housing Capital Fund Grant Program and Capital Fund Stimulus Grant. Mr. Jump stated that these three programs had no deficiencies and no audit findings.

Mr. Jump stated that RRHA has had two consecutive years of audits with no findings, and that qualifies RRHA as low-risk.

Mr. Jump stated that the audit of RRHA by his firm went very smoothly and that RRHA is financially sound. Information was provided in a timely manner, and the entire RRHA staff was extremely accommodating and professional.

Mr. Jump asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Chairperson Garner stated that RRHA is managed very well. Chairperson Garner said that he learned, in discussion with Mr. Jump, that not all housing authorities produce monthly financial statements. Those monthly statements allow RRHA to stay on top of the financial status of the housing authority. Ms. Austin and her staff are to be commended for another great audit and having all necessary documents ready for Jump, Scutellaro and Company, LLP.

Chairperson Garner thanked Mr. Jump for his presentation.

2. Resolution No. 3692

Ms. Cathy Wells, RRHA VP of Resident Services and Administration, asked for approval of Resolution No. 3692 approving a revised Personnel Policy regarding Harassment. Ms. Wells stated that the policy was last revised on December 20, 1996, and the policy needed to be brought in to compliance with current law. The policy has been reviewed by RRHA's legal counsel and determined to be in compliance with legal requirements applicable to RRHA.

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Commissioner Smith introduced Resolution No. 3692 and moved its adoption as introduced:

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND
HOUSING AUTHORITY APPROVING A REVISED PERSONNEL POLICY
REGARDING HARASSMENT**

WHEREAS, the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA) has a Personnel Policy regarding Harassment which was last revised December 20, 1996; and

WHEREAS, RRHA has undertaken a review of its personnel policies to ensure they are relevant, meet the needs of the agency and are legally compliant; and

WHEREAS, RRHA has determined that it is prudent and in the best interest of RRHA to revise Personnel Policy No. 402, Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment; and

WHEREAS, the proposed revised Personnel Policy No. 402, Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment has been reviewed by RRHA's legal counsel and determined to be in compliance with legal requirements applicable to RRHA; and

WHEREAS, the Personnel Committee of the RRHA Board of Commissioners supports and recommends approval of this revised policy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commissioners of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority that the attached revised Personnel Policy No. 402, Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment, is approved, effective May 1, 2012.

The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Boitnott and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner thereupon declared said motion carried and Resolution No. 3692 adopted as introduced.

3. Resolution No. 3693

Ms. Cathy Wells asked for approval of Resolution No. 3693 approving revised Personnel Policies regarding Insurance Programs and Personal Time Off. Ms. Wells stated that it has been determined that making these benefits available to employees who work a regular schedule of 30 hours or more per week is a cost effective avenue to recruit and retain highly skilled employees.

Commissioner Witten asked if the Grievance Policy was open to all employees prior to this change. Ms. Wells stated that the Grievance Policy is open to all

employees except for contract employees, temporary employees or permanent employees who are in their first six months of employment and the Grievance Policy will not be affected by these proposed policy revisions.

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Vice-Chair Boitnott introduced Resolution No. 3693 and moved its adoption as introduced:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY APPROVING REVISED PERSONNEL POLICIES REGARDING INSURANCE PROGRAMS AND PERSONAL TIME OFF

WHEREAS, the Roanoke Redevelopment & Housing Authority (RRHA) provides comprehensive insurance and paid time off benefits to its employees; and

WHEREAS, based on a review of RRHA's current workforce needs and legal requirements, RRHA has determined that it is prudent and in the best interest of RRHA to revise Personnel Policy No. 350, Insurance Programs and Personnel Policy No. 311, Personal Time Off; and

WHEREAS, the eligibility requirements contained in the current Insurance Programs and Paid Time Off policies restrict RRHA's ability to recruit and retain highly skilled employees; and

WHEREAS, the eligibility requirement for health insurance coverage currently contained in Personnel Policy No. 350 is not consistent with employer mandates included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care; and

WHEREAS, RRHA has determined that making certain benefits available to employees who work a regular schedule of 30 hours or more per week is a cost effective avenue to further RRHA's goals for recruitment and retention of highly skilled employees;

WHEREAS, the Personnel Committee of the RRHA Board of Commissioners supports and recommends approval of these revised policies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commissioners of the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority that the attached revised Personnel Policy No. 350, Insurance Programs and revised Personnel Policy No. 311, Personal Time Off, are approved effective May 1, 2012.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Burruss and upon roll call the

following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner thereupon declared said motion carried and Resolution No. 3693 adopted as introduced.

4. Resolution No. 3694

Mr. Joel Shank, RRHA VP of Operations, asked for approval of Resolution No. 3694 awarding a contract for roof replacement for Morningside Manor under the Capital Fund Program (CFP) Grant Number VA36P01150110. Mr. Shank stated that there was a significant difference between the amounts of the three bids that were submitted and that he talked to each contractor to review the specifications. It was determined that McNeil Roofing, Inc. has employees who are certified for asbestos abatement and, therefore, would not have to subcontract that portion of the work. The company representative also told Mr. Shank that they have use of a crane at an attractive price for use in the roof replacement.

Vice-Chair Boitnott asked if RRHA had contracted with McNeil Roofing, Inc. for previous work. Mr. Shank stated that RRHA has not used McNeil Roofing, Inc. in the past. Mr. Shank stated that he called 4 or 5 references, including government agencies in the surrounding localities, and they all spoke very favorably of the work done by McNeil Roofing, Inc.

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Commissioner Smith introduced Resolution No. 3694 and moved its adoption as

introduced:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY AWARDING A CONTRACT FOR ROOF REPLACEMENT FOR MORNINGSIDE MANOR UNDER THE CAPITAL FUND PROGRAM (CFP) GRANT NUMBER VA36P01150110

WHEREAS, the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA) has been awarded a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Capital Fund Program (CFP), grant number VA36P01150110 in the amount of \$2,171,100.00; and

WHEREAS, roof replacement for Morningside Manor was included on the Annual Statement detailing the planned use of CFP grant number VA36P01150110, which was approved by the RRHA Board of Commissioners by Resolution No. 3603 on July 26, 2010; and

WHEREAS, RRHA needs a qualified contractor to replace the roofing system at Morningside Manor, AMP 208; and

WHEREAS, RRHA issued an Invitation for Bid on March 18, 2012, with bids being due on April 10, 2012; and

WHEREAS, RRHA received three (3) responsive bids to the invitation which were opened for consideration, such bids being as follows:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Total Bid Amount</u>
Melvin T. Morgan Roofing & Sheet Metal Co., Inc.	\$451,067.00
McNeil Roofing, Inc.	\$273,539.00
John T. Morgan Roofing & Sheet Metal Co., Inc. (Self-certified as Section 3 Business Concern)	\$517,803.00

WHEREAS, HUD regulations at 24 CFR 135.1 state that "section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701u) (section 3) directs that employment and other economic opportunities generated by certain HUD financial assistance shall to the greatest extent feasible, and consistent with existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, be directed to ... business concerns which provide economic opportunities to low- and very low-income persons."; and

WHEREAS, one of the bids received by RRHA in this procurement was submitted by a self-certified section 3 business concern; and

WHEREAS, RRHA has adopted the method for providing preference in the award of section 3 covered contracts under a sealed bid process defined in section III(2)(i) of the Appendix to Part 135 of Section 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations,

which defines the preference to be provided to section 3 business concerns when the lowest responsible bid is at least \$200,000 but less than \$300,000 as the lesser of 8% of that bid or \$21,000; and

WHEREAS, the amount of the preference provided for section 3 business concerns in this procurement is \$21,000; and

WHEREAS, the lowest bid submitted by a section 3 business concern is \$517,803, submitted by J. T. Morgan Roofing & Sheet Metal Co., Inc., which is not within \$21,000 of the lowest responsive bid of \$273,539; and

WHEREAS, section III(2)(ii) of the Appendix to Part 135 of Section 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations states, "If no responsive bid by a section 3 business concern meets (2)(i) of this section, the contract shall be awarded to a responsible bidder with the lowest responsive bid"; and

WHEREAS, the lowest responsive bid in this procurement was submitted by McNeil Roofing, Inc., with a bid amount of \$273,539; and

WHEREAS, the amount of the bid submitted by McNeil Roofing, Inc. was determined to be fair and reasonable for the work specified when compared to the amount of the independent cost estimate, generated by Martin & Co., Architects, for the project; and

WHEREAS, review, evaluation, and confirmation of bid documentation has been completed, and McNeil Roofing, Inc. has been found to be capable and in all other respects acceptable to RRHA; and

WHEREAS, the Vice President of Operations recommends an award to McNeil Roofing, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director has determined that this procurement complies with RRHA's Procurement Policy and that it is in the best interest of RRHA to accept such bid and execute an appropriate contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commissioners of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority that:

- (1) The bid submitted by McNeil Roofing, Inc. be and hereby is accepted;
- (2) The Executive Director be and hereby is authorized and directed to execute a standard contract for construction, which by reference is inclusive of all plans, specifications, addenda and related project documents, between McNeil Roofing, Inc. and RRHA for the fixed price of \$273,539.00.

- (3) The Executive Director be and hereby is authorized to take such other actions as may be necessary to fulfill the intent of this Resolution.

The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Boitnott and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner thereupon declared said motion carried and Resolution No. 3694 adopted as introduced.

Commissioner Butler asked for an explanation of Section 3 self-certification. Ms. Edwards stated that RRHA publishes the criteria for what would make a business eligible to claim a Section 3 preference in the procurement process. The business completes and submits a notarized form self-certifying that the business meets Section 3 business concern criteria. Ms. Edwards stated Nick Conte, RRHA legal counsel, reviewed the regulations and consulted with HUD legal counsel. Mr. Conte determined that HUD allows self-certification, and RRHA implemented that procedure rather than having RRHA to be responsible for certification of Section 3 business concerns.

Ms. Edwards stated that the self-certification form does inform the business of the penalties if false information is provided on the form in order to claim the Section 3 preference. The form also states clearly that RRHA reserves the right to require supporting documentation to verify information submitted on the form.

Commissioner Butler asked if businesses claiming the preference are spot audited for compliance and said that the accepting self-certification could leave room for potential fraud. Ms. Edwards stated that the form contains statements informing

contractors of the penalties if it is determined that they submitted false information.

RRHA also reserves the right to audit the self-certification process.

Chairperson Garner asked for clarification as to whether HUD can and does spot audit Section 3 businesses for compliance. Ms. Edwards stated that HUD does not audit businesses; however, housing authorities can perform audits and require supporting documentation. HUD does not require such auditing. Commissioner Butler stated that the onus to audit would be on RRHA rather than HUD. Ms. Edwards stated that Commissioner Butler was correct.

Ms. Edwards asked Mr. Conte if he had anything further to add. Mr. Conte stated that that self-certification is acceptable to HUD, and there is more potential liability if RRHA takes the responsibility to certify Section 3 businesses.

Ms. Wells stated that since RRHA moved to Section 3 self-certification there has not been an increase in the number of businesses claiming the Section 3 preference.

Commissioner Butler stated that some businesses that have a high turnover in staff may meet Section 3 criteria one day and not the next. Ms. Edwards affirmed and stated that was the primary reason RRHA changed the certification from annually to certifying as of the date of submission for each procurement.

5. Resolution No. 3695

Ms. Glenda Edwards asked for approval of Resolution No. 3695 authorizing approval of submission and execution of documents necessary for submission of a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Ms. Edwards stated that the grant application requires documents to be signed by the Board Chair and the Executive Director.

Commissioner Burruss asked for a description of the boundaries of the Loudon-Melrose and Shenandoah West neighborhoods. Ms. Edwards stated that the area includes both the Melrose Towers and Lansdowne Park public housing developments and north-west boundaries are Melrose Avenue and Shenandoah Avenue. Mr. Desi Wynter stated that the area also is bounded by 36th Street just before Fairview Elementary School. Mr. Shank stated that the east-west boundaries are 36th and 14th Streets.

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Commissioner Smith introduced Resolution No. 3695 and moved its adoption as introduced:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF A CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA) approved a Strategic Plan October 2009 – September 2014 by Resolution Number 3561 on September 28, 2009 which included a goal to lead the development of sustainable, high-quality, mixed-income, small-scale housing driven by the needs of the people to be served; and

WHEREAS, on February 29, 2012, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) issued a Notice of Funding Availability for Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grants; and

WHEREAS, Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant applications must propose to plan for the revitalization of a severely distressed public and/or HUD-assisted multifamily housing project located in a distressed neighborhood into a viable, mixed-income community; and

WHEREAS, RRHA has identified the Loudon-Melrose and Shenandoah West neighborhoods, in which both the Melrose Towers and Lansdowne Park public housing developments are located, as meeting the criteria for a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application to provide funding for development of a neighborhood transformation plan; and

WHEREAS, HUD requires RRHA to provide certain certifications and agreements in connection with the Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application and implementation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commissioners of the City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority that:

1. Submission of a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application for funding to develop a transformation plan for the Loudon-Melrose and Shenandoah West neighborhoods, including the Melrose Towers and Lansdowne Park public housing developments, is approved; and
2. The Executive Director is authorized to execute documents and provide required certifications and agreements, including the attached HUD Form 53156, Choice Neighborhoods Application Certifications - Planning Grants, for submission of a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and
3. The Board Chair is authorized to execute documents and provide required certifications and agreements, including the attached HUD Form 53156, Choice Neighborhoods Application Certifications - Planning Grants, on behalf of the Board of Commissioners, for submission of a Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant application.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Butler and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner thereupon declared said motion carried and Resolution No. 3695 adopted as introduced.

Chairperson Garner asked if there were any other items to come before the Board of Commissioners. There were none.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, Commissioner Butler

moved that the meeting be adjourned.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Burruss and upon roll call the following vote was recorded:

AYES: Commissioners Burruss, Butler, Karnes, Smith, Witten, Boitnott,
Garner

NAYS: None

Chairperson Garner declared the meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Edward Garner, Chairperson

Glenda Edwards, Secretary-Treasurer

**CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS APPLICATION CERTIFICATIONS –
PLANNING GRANTS**

The following are certifications to and agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) required in connection with the Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grants application and implementation.

1. The public or assisted housing project targeted in this Choice Neighborhoods grant application meets the definition of severe distress in accordance with Section 24(j)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 ("1937Act").
2. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) have not received assistance from the Federal government, State, or unit of local government, or any agency or instrumentality, for the specific activities for which funding is requested in the Choice Neighborhoods application.
3. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) do not have any litigation pending which would preclude timely startup of activities.
4. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) are in full compliance with any desegregation or other court order related to Fair Housing (e.g., Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) that affects the Lead Applicant's and Co-Applicant's (if any) public or assisted housing program and that is in effect on the date of application submission.
5. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) have returned any excess advances received during development or modernization, or amounts determined by HUD to constitute excess financing based on a HUD-approved Actual Development Cost Certificate (ADCC) or Actual Modernization Cost Certificate (AMCC), or other HUD contracts, or that HUD has approved a pay-back plan.
6. There are no environmental factors, such as sewer moratoriums, precluding development in the requested locality.
7. In accordance with the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001-4128), the property targeted for acquisition or construction (including rehabilitation) is not located in an area identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as having special flood hazards, unless:
 - (a) The community in which the area is situated is participating in the National Flood Insurance program (see 44 CFR parts 59 through 79), or less than one year has passed since FEMA notification regarding such hazards; and
 - (b) Where the community is participating in the National Flood Insurance Program, flood insurance is obtained as a condition of execution of a Grant Agreement and approval of any subsequent demolition or disposition application.
8. The application does not target properties in the Coastal Barrier Resources System, in accordance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3501).

If selected for Choice Neighborhoods funding:

9. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure compliance with all policies, procedures, and requirements, including the Program Requirements provided in the NOFA Section III.C.3, prescribed by HUD for the Choice Neighborhoods Program.

OMB Approval No. 2577-0269
(exp. 1/31/2015)

10. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (of any), will ensure that Choice Neighborhoods grant activities are implemented in a timely, efficient, and economical manner. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (of any), will ensure that all FY2012 Choice Neighborhoods grant funds are expended by the statutory deadline. In accordance with 31 U.S.C. § 1552, all FY 2012 Choice Neighborhoods funds expire on September 30, 2019. Any funds that are not expended by that date will be cancelled and recaptured by the Treasury, and thereafter will not be available for obligation or expenditure for any purpose.
11. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure assistance from the Federal government, State, or unit of local government, or any agency or instrumentality is not received for the specific activities funded by the Choice Neighborhoods grant. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) has established controls to ensure that any activity funded by the Choice Neighborhoods grant is not also funded by any other HUD program, thereby preventing duplicate funding of any activity.
12. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure that more assistance is not provided to any housing site or neighborhood under the Choice Neighborhoods grant than is necessary to provide for the planning of affordable housing and neighborhood transformation after taking into account other governmental assistance provided.
13. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure that the aggregate amount of the Choice Neighborhoods grant is supplemented with funds from sources other than Choice Neighborhoods in an amount not less than 5 percent of the amount of the Choice Neighborhoods grant in accordance with Section III.B of the Planning Grants section of the NOFA.
14. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure compliance with:
- (a) The Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601-19) and regulations at 24 CFR part 100;
 - (b) The prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of disability under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and regulations at 24 CFR part 8);
 - (c) Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C 12101 et seq.) and its implementing regulations at 28 CFR part 36;
 - (d) The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4151) and regulations at 24 CFR part 40).
15. The Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (if any) will ensure compliance with all Choice Neighborhoods requirements for reporting, providing access to records, and evaluation.

Lead Applicant: City of Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority

Co-Applicant (if any): _____

Name of Targeted Public and/or Assisted Housing Site(s):

Melrose Towers and Lansdowne Park

I approve the submission of the Choice Neighborhoods application of which this document is a part and make the above certifications to and agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in connection with the application and implementation thereof:

Name of Lead Applicant's Executive Officer: Glenda Edwards

Title: Executive Director

Signature: Glenda Edwards

Date: 04/23/2012

Name of Co-Applicant's (if any) Executive Officer: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

The following signature is applicable if the Lead Applicant or Co-Applicant is a Public Housing Authority.

Acting on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority listed below, as its Chairman, I approve the submission of the Choice Neighborhoods application of which this document is a part and make the above certifications to and agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in connection with the application and implementation thereof:

Certified By: Board Chairman's Name: Edward Garner

Board Chairman's Signature: Edward Garner

Date: April 23, 2012

Warning: HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in the imposition of criminal and civil penalties. (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012, 32 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)